



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,394	12/17/2001	F. Peter Paddock	UTL 01-029	6551

7590 03/16/2004
James F. Baird, Esquire
33 East Main Street
P.O. Box 574
West Brookfield, MA 01585-0574

EXAMINER	
CORBIN, ARTHUR L	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1761	

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10108394

Applicant(s)

RADDOK

Examiner

Arthur L. Corbin

Group Art Unit

1761

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1761

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-6 are indefinite in failing to recite positive method steps, e.g. "freezing ". Claims 1, 3 and 5, step a) are redundant in reciting", being uncooked beef"; " being uncooked pork"; and "being uncooked poultry" since each meat product is recited in the preamble. Claims 1-6 are indefinite in failing to use proper Markush language in step e) of claims 1,3, and 5. Also, "that is ...USDA approved" (step e) and step f) of claims 1,3, and 5) is indefinite since it is not known what is USDA approved. Corrections are required without new matter.

3. Claims 1,3 and 5 are objected to because of the following informalities: In step e) of claims 1,3 and 5, "forming" should be changed to "to form". In step g) of claims 1,3, and 5: "and" should be added before "allowing"; "thereby" should be added before "forming", and "too" should be changed to "to".

Appropriate correction is required.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.


Art Unit: 1761

5. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenspan in view of Sair or Sair et al. Greenspan discloses freezing, tempering at 27-29 °F and slicing uncooked meat followed by treatment of the slices with a treatment solution including salt, water, spices, and dextrose (Ex.1 and col. 11). It would have been obvious to include sodium nitrate and sodium erythorbate in the treatment solution of Greenspan since both components are conventionally used together to treat meat products, as evidenced by Sair (Exs. 2 and 4) or Sair et al (Ex. 1). Further, it would have been obvious to treat pork or poultry in the same manner as the meat in Greenspan since pork and poultry are well known substitutes for beef. Packaging, cooling and freezing treated meat is also conventional in this art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arthur Corbin whose telephone number is (571) 272-1399. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10:30 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (571) 272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

A. Corbin/af
March 5, 2004



ARTHUR L. CORBIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
3-9-04